

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0018] of the specification as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added.

Independent claims 1 and 11, as amended, recite, among other features, transmitting the call processing-related traffic *and* the bearer traffic through the logical tunnels through the same set of physical links.

Without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, however, Applicant respectfully submits that the asserted combination does not disclose at least the aforementioned feature of claims 1 and 11, for at least the following reason.

The Office Action contends that Kumar meets that aforementioned feature of claims 1 and 11. (Office Action, page 2).

Kumar discusses the three stages of signaling that are typically used to establish a call across a network, with each signaling stage being triggered by a previous stage. (Kumar, page 2, paragraph [0018]. Thus, for example, FIG. 2 of Kumar illustrates a process performed by one network, such as that illustrated in FIG. 1A, in establishing a call using Q.2630.1 AAL2 signaling. While paragraph [0021] of Kumar, for example, does discuss bearer traffic, it is not readily apparent from a reading of Kumar that all of the call-related traffic, including call-processing traffic and bearer traffic, is transmitted through logical tunnels over the same set of physical links in the network.

Hassan-Ali is cited for its alleged disclosure of various features of claims 1 and 11 other than the aforementioned feature. Applicant respectfully submits that Hassan-Ali does not add anything to the disclosure of Kumar that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency.

Also, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to combine Kumar with Hassan-Ali.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully

requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-20) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to telephone John S. Zanghi, at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP


10/17/07
Date


John S. Zanghi
Reg. No. 48,843
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☒ transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature 
Date <u>10-17-07</u>	Printed Name Elaine M. Checovich